

DIOCESE OF NIAGARA.

SELECTIONS

—FROM THE—

ADDRESS OF THE LORD BISHOP

Rev. Thomas Brock Fuller

OF NIAGARA.

*Delivered at the Annual Session of the Synod of the
Diocese of Niagara, on the 31st May, 1881, and
unanimously ordered by the Synod to be
printed and distributed throughout
the Diocese.*

HAMILTON, ONT. :

ENNIS AND STIRTON, PRINTERS, 16 MAIN ST. EAST, COR. HUGHSON.

1881.

HAMILTON PUBLIC LIBRARY

INSTRUCTION IN REGARD TO THE PRINCIPLES OF THE CHURCH.

I have already urged upon my clerical brothers the duty of thoroughly instructing those whom they purpose presenting for confirmation in all things they ought to know, in connection with that apostolic rite ; but I feel that our clergy should go a good deal further. I fear that there is *amongst* our people, both old and young, great ignorance in regard to the Church of God. A great many persons in our communion, and almost the whole Protestant body outside our communion, are in entire ignorance of the English Church's existence prior to the time of Henry VIII. of England, and consequently are forced to the conclusion that our Church, under that monarch, separated from the Church of Rome, just as the Wesleyan Methodists separated from our Church in the last century, with no more authority for doing so ; and that, therefore we were equally guilty of *schism*.

We do not look to our public schools for instruction on the all important subject of religion. Because, alas ! such is the divided state of Christianity in our country, that our public school teachers could not be satisfactorily intrusted with that paramount duty. Others, therefore, must perform it. Those, to whom we have a right to look for the performance of this great duty, are the parents, sponsors and spiritual pastors of the members of the Church. Would to God ! that the old, goodly custom of catechising were revived amongst us. I firmly believe that such a course of instruction would be far more serviceable than most of the sermons now delivered from your pulpits. Let me then exhort you, my clerical brethren, to catechise the children of your Sunday schools *publicly in the church* during divine service, at least once a month, wherever it can be done. If you will give as much time and attention to the preparation of your catechistical instructions as you do to your sermons, you will find that after a little while you will be able to make this instruction not only very interesting to your young people, but also to the older members of your congregations. I have frequently heard the church people at Welland, both old and young, speak with great satisfaction and gratitude of the late Rev. John Stannege's catechising them. They said that they learned more about the Bible, the Church and Prayer Book, from it than from all the sermons they had heard during their whole lives. Of course the practice I urge upon you would involve no little trouble, but if it will be for the good of your people (as I am satisfied it will be, if you do your best), you surely will not regard that. The basis of your teaching should be the Church Catechism, which sets forth most clearly, in a most wonderful manner, our great privileges and duties, as covenant children of God—what we ought to “believe and to do” as such ; both in relation to our duty towards God and to our fellow-creatures too. It teaches us, more-

MAR 12 1965

HAMILTON PUBLIC LIBRARY

over, where we may obtain the assistance which we require to enable us to live as becomes the children of God. This catechism should be enlarged upon, and its different points should be deeply impressed on the minds and hearts of your people. The Constitution of the Church of Christ, of which they are all members, should also be clearly explained to them. They should be made to realize that the Church is a *Divine Institution*, and not one to be constructed by the holiest and ablest of fallen Adam's race. It may be profitable for us on this occasion to go back, in imagination, to the time when Christ established His Church on earth. He had suffered on the accursed cross a ransom for the sins of the world, He had arisen triumphant from the grave and appeared to His disciples again. We are informed by St. John, (whose Gospel supplies us with many things that had been unmentioned by the other Evangelists) "that on one occasion soon after His resurrection, Jesus came to His disciples, unexpectedly, and said to them: 'Peace be unto you, as my Father hath sent me, even so send I you, and when he had said this He breathed on them and said unto them, 'Receive the Holy Ghost, whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted; whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained.' " Before His ascension into Heaven the blessed Saviour met His disciples by appointment in Galilee. He spent sometime with them there, and conversed with them regarding the things pertaining to the Kingdom of God; that is (according to a Presbyterian commentator) "He gave them instructions about the organization, spread and edification of His Church," and closed his intercourse with them by asserting the possession of "all power in heaven and on earth" and by giving them their commission to establish His Church on earth, with the assurance that He would be with them to the end of the world: "And Jesus came and spake unto them, saying, All power is given unto me in heaven and on earth, go ye therefore and teach (or make disciples of) all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you. Lo I am with you always, to the end of the world." Here we have several very remarkable particulars—1st, the breathing on His chosen Apostles, on those who had been His friends and companions for three years; 2nd, His declaration, "As my father hath sent me, so send I you;" 3rd, His long intercourse with the eleven in Galilee, where He gives them, (as is acknowledged by all) instructions regarding His Church; 4th, His claim to "all power in heaven and on earth;" 5th, His commission to establish His Church; 6th, His promise to be with that Church to the end of the world. Here are a very great many important events in our blessed Lord's life, too great for anything less than the establishment of His Church on earth. Why else did he breathe on His disciples? Why else did He say to them? "As my father hath sent Me,

so send I you." Why else did He converse so long a time with them in Galilee, giving them, no doubt, full directions about the establishment of His Church? Why else did He assert that "all power had been given unto him, both in heaven and on earth?" Why else did He so solemnly commission His disciples to plant His Church on earth, and to initiate immortal beings into it by baptising them in the names of the several persons of the eternal Trinity? And lastly, why else did he give them His gracious promise to be with them in this great work to the end of the world? Assuredly it was to mark in a most emphatic manner the great event of the founding of His Church. Nothing short of such an event was worthy of such important proofs of our blessed Lord's interest in it; and when we come to consider the importance of the work committed to the Church for all time to come, even the salvation of countless myriads of immortal souls, we can easily see how entirely worthy of Christ's deepest interest it was. No sooner had Christ left His disciples than they began the work that He had left them to do, and the very first thing they did was to fill up the number of the apostles, for, selecting two of the disciples who had been with Jesus during His ministry, they prayed, saying "Thou, Lord, which knowest the hearts of all men, show which of these two thou hast chosen, that he might take part of this ministry and apostleship, from which Judas by transgression fell, that he might go to his own place. "And they gave forth their lots, and the lot fell upon Matthias, and he was numbered with the eleven apostles." Remember that this was the first act of the inspired apostles after Jesus had given them full directions about His Church on earth. The very first thing they did was to fill up their number, just as any corporate body sees that its number is filled up on the death or resignation of one of its body. Who can believe that the inspired apostles, in performing this their first public act, did not carry out *the very directions* that they had *received from their ascended Lord*? And who can fail to see that by filling up their "ministry and apostleship" they gave us an assurance that that ministry and apostleship was to be *continued* in the Church of Christ? Having thus filled up their number they were in a position to commence the work of proclaiming the glad tidings of salvation, which they did on the great day of Pentecost, when there were added to the infant church no less than 3,000 souls, the Holy Ghost thus *endorsing* the acts of the apostles in filling up their number. Here then, we have a corporate body fully established, in full operation, and that corporate body the Church of Christ! Note especially that there was but one church, not a dozen churches, but *one Church*. In a few years that church was planted in many different lands, but it was still one and the same Church; for a Christian of those days, whenever he might travel found himself at *home*. If he visited half a dozen cities in

the course of his journeyings, he could present himself (if duly certified) at any Lord's table and receive the sacrament of the body and blood of his blessed Lord. He was not obliged to inquire for the Church of his particular denomination, for, at that time, there were no denominations of Christians. These are of modern date. This is a *fact*, which, I believe, none will dispute, and it is one well worthy of your most serious consideration. And this blessed state of things continued till the separation of the Eastern and Western branches of that Church in the ninth century. Now these are *facts*, which our young people—nay, our old people, too—need to have taught to them. The ministry of that Church has been handed down, from age to age, in a regular order, called “the apostolical succession,” so that I can give you a list of succeeding bishops from the days of the apostles till we come down to the setting apart of your unworthy Bishop in St. Thomas' Church, in this city, on the *first day of May in the year of Grace, 1875*. Many of our people believe that the Church of England began under Henry VIII, and had no independent existence in England till that period. This is a great mistake. The Church of England, as a branch of the Church of Christ, existed from the first century in Britain, just as other branches of the Church of Christ had existed in France, Spain, Italy, Macedonia, and many cities and countries of Asia Minor. Some very learned writers contend that St. Paul himself, when fulfilling his intention of going into Spain, (mentioned in his epistle to the Romans,) went to “the uttermost parts of the earth and the islands that lie in the ocean.” It is, moreover, *certain* that a branch of the Christian Church was formed at a very early period in Britain, probably as early as the apostles' times, for Tertullion, a Christian father who flourished A. D. 190, thus testifies to the introduction of Christianity into Britain: “Some countries of the Britians, which proved inaccessible to the Romans, are subject to Christ,” and again, “Britain lies surrounded by the ocean. The Mauri and the barbarous Getulians are blocked up by the Romans, lest they should extend the limits of their countries. The Romans, with all their armies, are unable to extend their empire beyond those nations; whereas the Kingdom of Christ and His name reach much further; He is everywhere believed in and worshipped by all the nations above-mentioned.” Origen, another father, who flourished in the third century, thus writes: “When did Britain, before the coming of Christ, consent to the worship of one God?” This certainly intimates that in his time the Britons were known to be Christians, and had, through the profession of Christianity, been brought off from their former idolatry. In the fourth century the eloquent Chrysostom thus testified to the same truth: “The British Isles, situated beyond the sea, lying in the very ocean, have felt the power of the word, for even there churches are built and altars are erected.” And

again, "Into whatsoever church thou shalt enter, whether amongst the Moors, or the Persians, or the inhabitants of the Islands of Britain, thou hearest John declaring 'It is not lawful for thee to have thy brother's wife.'" That this was acknowledged by the other branches of the Christian Churches as a free and independent branch, cannot be denied, for we find it represented in the Council of Arles, in France ; by Restitutius, Bishop of London ; Eborius, Bishop of York, and Adelphius, Bishop of Lincoln. This Council was held as early as the year A. D. 334. Again, we find the British Bishops summoned, along with the Bishops of Gaul to the Council of Sardica in 347, by Constantius. They were likewise present at the Council of Ariminum. Now, from these indisputable facts it must be evident to all that at that very early period, an independent branch of the Church existed in Britain, just as there were branches of the Church at Rome, at Corinth, etc. The Church of Britain was then governed, as it is now, by its bishops, who were in subjection to their archbishops as at present ; of whom there were three, of London, York and Carleon-on-Usk. There was no Church in Christendom founded by the apostles which had not from them a succession of bishops, and these were in all provinces subject to a primate of their own number. Thus the Bishop of Rome was at that time Primate of the middle and southern parts of Italy, the Bishop of Milan, of the northern part ; the Bishops of Jerusalem, Antioch, and Alexandria, had the same authority in some of the Eastern provinces. There was no Bishop at Rome, or elsewhere, who, at that period, pretended to any authority beyond his own diocese or province. The evidences of the Church's existence in Britain crowd upon us as we advance down the stream of history. At length, in A. D. 596—centuries after the first establishment of the Church in Britain—Gregory, surnamed the Great, Bishop of Rome, sent the celebrated Augustine to preach the gospel to the Anglo-Saxons, who were then pagans. Augustin found Bertha, Queen of Ethelbert, King of Kent, a Christian, and by her his mission was favored. Ethelbert himself was converted. Many of his subjects were baptized by Augustine and his followers. Some years after his arrival in England Augustine took a journey to the Western countries whither the British Church had been driven, and having asked for a conference with it, was met on the banks of the Severn by seven bishops and their most learned men from Bangor-Iscoed, the chief nursery of the Church, and Dinot, their Abbot. Augustine made proposals to them to unite with him and his followers in the work in which they were then engaged. But the terms of their proposal were such that an independent branch of the Church like the British Church could not accede to. He proposed to them to give up several of their established customs and to put themselves in subjection to the Bishop of Rome. To this Dinot

answered in these words : "Be it known without doubt unto you, that we are all, every one of us, obedient and subject to the Church of God, and to the Pope of Rome, and to every one in his degree, in perfect charity, to help every one of them, by words and deeds, to be the children of God. Other obedience than this I do not know as due to him whom ye name the Pope, nor to be Father of Fathers, to be claimed and to be demanded, and this obedience we are ready to give and to pay to him and to every Christian continually. Besides, we are under the government of the Bishop of Carleon-on-Usk, who is to oversee, under God, over us, to cause us to keep the life eternal." This surely, is the language of one belonging to an independent branch of the Church, owing no subjection whatever to Rome. Bede, the celebrated church historian, tells us that the British Bishops would not acknowledge Augustine as Archbishop over them. The British Church continued independent of the Anglo-Saxon Church till the reign of Henry the First, having a Metropolitan of its own at St. David's. And even the Anglo-Saxon Church differed from the Bishop of Rome and refused to acknowledge his authority ; an instance of which we have in the case of Bishop Wilfred, who, having been ejected from his see for some flagrant offences, applied to Rome and was sustained by the Bishop of that lordly city, who wrote to Alfred to reinstate him in his Bishopric. But Alfred, who reigned alone at the time of his arrival in Britain, scorned to receive him, and expressed in no unmeasured terms his contempt for Papal rescripts. The Church of England also showed herself slow to embrace the innovations adopted by the Church of Rome. Of this, I will mention only one case out of many that might be given. In the year 792 a book was forwarded from the East to the Emperor Charlemagne containing the decrees of a Greek Council, in favor of the religious adoration of images. Charlemagne sent this work to the Bishops of England requesting their judgment regarding it. All the Bishops concurred in condemning this new doctrine, which they declared the Church of Christ holds accursed, and they engaged Albinus to write against it. He did so ; and writing in the name and with the authority of the English Church, and using the soundest scriptural arguments, notwithstanding that Adrian, the Pope of that time, had approved of the idolatrous practice, he effectually engaged Charlemagne to use his influence to check it. In 794, Charlemagne called together a Council at Frankfort-on-the-Maine, in which 300 Bishops solemnly condemned the doctrine of the Greek Church and of the Popes, and thus prevented for a long time afterwards the progress of error in Britain. But the civil power in England, which was linked with the Romish party, proved too strong for the British Church, and it became subjugated by it. Early, however, in the 16th century, the Bishops and clergy of the Church, acting in concert with the civil power which had then

quarrelled with the Pope, threw off the supremacy of the Pope and the other innovations that had been *forced* upon her and stood forth to the world once more an independent branch of the Church of Christ, freed from the thralldom of Rome and relieved from the accumulated corruption of centuries. Roman Catholics do not deny that *before* the reformation, the Church of England was a branch of the Church of Christ ; but they say that she ceased to be such when she threw off the usurpation of Rome and reformed herself. One might just as well contend, however, that when Naaman washed seven times in Jordan and was cleansed of his leprosy, he ceased to be a Syrian ; that he lost his post and his privileges ; that he ceased to be a great man with his master and honorable ; that he ceased to be captain of the host of the King of Syria. One might just as well contend that a dissipated magistrate ceases to be a magistrate when he throws off the thralldom of sin and becomes a reformed character. To adopt another kind of illustration : It is well known that Napoleon Bonaparte, in his career of conquests, overran the greater part of Europe, and obtained the kingdom of Spain partly by stratagem and partly by force of arms. The Spaniards never liked Joseph, whom his brother made King of Spain. When, therefore, the English, under the immortal Wellington, came to their assistance, the Spaniards gladly united with them in driving out the usurper and restoring the former royal family to the throne. Now, no one contends for a moment that the kingdom of Spain was not identically the same kingdom when freed from the presence of the French armies that it was before they came to Spain, although, in the meanwhile, Spain had been under the occupation of Bonaparte. Nor, will any one contend that the kingdom of France was not the same kingdom when Louis XVIII. was established on his throne that it was when governed by his grandfather, Louis XVI., although it had seen great changes in the meanwhile, and few of the same men lived and acted that had lived and acted before the bloody French revolution ? Now, if this be so—and it cannot be denied—we may surely believe the Church of England to be the *same* Church that it was when represented in the Council of Arles, in France, by the Bishops of London, York and Lincoln, although the usurpation of Rome and its accompanying errors subsequently prevailed over it for many years. Length of time makes no difference in the *principle* of this thing. If it be the same Church after an usurpation of ten years, it is the same Church after an usurpation of some hundreds of years. And so we cannot be guilty of the sin of *schism*. Previous to this reformation (commenced in Henry the VIII.'s reign) the Church of England had been a living branch of the Church of Christ. It is true that, in the course of years, she had lost a portion of her freedom and had been more or less incrustated with errors that had sprung up in the dark ages. Like the

other branches of the Church in the West, she had become disfigured by errors of opinion, and by unscriptural practices. But these, so far, were like excrescences on the human body. They were no part of her. They had in no way been incorporated with her. In the good providence of God the time came at last when she was to be reformed, and she did reform herself canonically, regularly and thoroughly. She removed the accumulated rubbish of centuries, as a pure reformed branch of the Church of Christ; but she remained the *same* Church she was before, *minus* the rubbish. She retained the same ministry that she had had from the Apostolic age, the old creeds of the church, and she rearranged her ritual on primitive models, retaining all that was scriptural and ancient, and rejecting all that was unscriptural and modern. She rejected the supremacy of the Pope, transubstantiation, the worshipping of images, the invocation of saints, purgatory, the denial of the cup to the laity, enforced auricular confession to a priest, and the use of the liturgy in an unknown tongue. The Church of England had the same creeds then that she has now; but she had errors, which she removed at the reformation. These were not matters of faith even with the Church of Rome at the time, and consequently not binding on the consciences of her people. Most of them were mere *opinions*, which might be held or not. The difference between the action of the two branches of the Church consisted in this, that the Church of England *renounced* all these erroneous opinions and unscriptural practices, whilst the Church of Rome *retained* them. The Pope called together the Council of Trent, packed (as Sarpi, who was one of the bishops present at it, tells us) for his own purpose; and that Council declared all those erroneous opinions to be *articles of faith*, to be believed by all Christians as they regarded their souls' salvation. By this act the Church of Rome was guilty of *schism*. She *added* new articles of faith to the old fundamental articles which the whole Christian world had held from early times, and anathematized all who would not accept these new articles of faith. And to this day Romanists continue in this schism, requiring you and all other Protestants to believe and to do things which, on their own showing, they did not themselves demand of their people the day before the Council of Trent tacked them to the old Creed, each with its anathemas against unbelievers. Romanists endeavor to confuse the minds of people with regard to the Council of Trent. They call it a "general council," that is, a council of all the Churches of Christendom. But it was by no means such. It consisted largely of those bishops who were under the immediate control of the Pope, and who were ready to do his bidding. England, Scotland, Ireland, and the whole Greek Church were unrepresented there. It was no more a "general council" of the Church of Christ than was the conference at Lambeth Palace in 1878, which I had the great honor of attending. And in regard to the opinions which

were for the first time declared to be "articles of faith binding upon all men," some few Romish writers assert that they were always held in the Church. This is, however, generally acknowledged not to have been the case. But even if they had been so, no Council like that of Trent had a right to make them articles of faith or communion. Recent events in the Romish Church throw much light on the action of that Council. In 1854 the Church of Rome decreed the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary; and in 1870 the infallibility of the Pope. The received faith of all Christians up to 1854 was, that Christ *alone* was born without sin. The most deluded Romanist, who knows anything about the matter, will not deny that. And the Church of Rome, as a Church, held the same. But so greatly had the worship of the Virgin grown up amongst Romanists that many of them felt it *necessary* to claim for her a sinless immaculate conception. Up, however, to 1854 the idea of her having been so born was merely an *opinion* amongst the more devoted of her worshippers. Some learned doctors advocated the claim; others wrote against it. It was a question of opinion only. A man might write against it as earnestly as he choose, yet die a good son of the Church; perhaps be canonized after death. But in 1854 the Pope called together a Council, which he declared to be a "General Council," but which was nothing of the kind, and that Council declared that the Virgin Mary was conceived without sin, added that to the new articles of faith which had been added to the ancient creeds by the Council of Trent, and excommunicated all who called in question the Virgin's immaculate conception. The day before the decree of the Council was passed, a man might have written a book against it without any fault being found with him; the day after he was as much bound to believe it as he was bound to "believe in God the Father Almighty." At least, so the Church of Rome holds. Thus, from time to time, has that Church presumed to add new doctrines to the older accepted creeds of Christianity. Thus again in 1870, "The Council of the Vatican" decreed that the Pope of Rome is infallible, and that all true sons and daughters of the Church are, since the promulgation of that new doctrine as an article of the faith, bound to believe it, whether they are convinced of its truth or not, on pain of eternal condemnation. The day before that dogma was formulated they might believe it or not; the next day they were deprived of that right. As many of you doubtless remember, the enactment of that dogma as an article of faith was long and bitterly opposed by seventy of the ablest and most learned bishops from all parts of the globe, who argued most ably and earnestly that such a dogma was not to be found in the sacred Scriptures or in the writings of the primitive Church, but that it was diametrically opposed thereto; but the Pope who as a man,

had his heart set upon securing that position for himself, carried it chiefly through the great number of Italian Bishops whom he had summoned to the Council. Now, these so-called "General Councils" did (or pretended, rather, to do) what no Council has the right to do, viz., impose on me and you terms of communion which had been unknown in the Church of Christ for a thousand years. When they did this they built a wall in the sight of men and of angels, which separated themselves from me and you and the outside world ; and thus they became schismatics. I claim, on the other hand, that the Church of England and the Churches in communion with her are the only bodies (with the exception of the Syrian Church of St. Thomas in India) which *have not added new doctrines to the old doctrines of the apostles' times* ; therefore are the only Churches that have not broken the unity of the Spirit. The position of the Church of England in the middle of the sixteenth century was no more nor less than that held by the Church of Christ from the first. She required then, and she requires still (as has been well remarked) of all who would enter her fold or seek communion with her, only the faith as it is expressed in the old creeds of the Church. All other matters she leaves (as always did the early Church) to free discussion amongst her members, to the effect of a scriptural worship and the administration of the two sacraments instituted by Christ himself, aided by the constant reading of the pure *word of God in all the assemblies of her saints*. But this position occupied by the Church did not satisfy some of her members. The mental activity of the times turned almost exclusively on religious matters and almost every one had his own favorite views and notions. Some contended that the Church had not gone far enough, that she was only half reformed, that she ought to have done as the reformers on the continent and as Scotland had done, who had destroyed the Church instead of merely reforming it. In fact, they wanted her to do *just what* the Church of Rome had done—to adopt new dogmas and to institute new confessions of faith. This she would not do. She felt that she had the deposit of the faith handed down from apostolic times, pure and unadulterated, and she was determined to tack nothing to the old Christian rules ; she was determined to have nothing added to the old creeds of Christianity. Others might admire—and, if they pleased, adopt—the new-fangled notions ; but it was her duty to hand down to posterity the old creeds and the old practices as she had received them from the apostolic age. Finding her thus steadfast in her principles and resolute in carrying them out, they separated from her ; they broke the unity of the Church of Christ as far as they could, and were guilty of *the sin of schism*. They set up their own confessions of faith ; they proclaimed their new dogmas, and called upon all good people everywhere to "come

out of the Church of England and to join the saints of the living God." Thus began the first great schism from the Church of England because she denied the faith once for all delivered to the saints, or because she had added anything thereto, or because she had lost the sacraments, or because she did not set forth righteousness, or charity towards men or holiness towards God. The chief reasons *alleged* for this schism were that she did not adopt the creed and government set up in Geneva by John Calvin, of which they had become quite enamoured; that her clergy wore surplices, and that her churches had bells in their steeples outside of them, and organs and stained glass inside of them. This schism gave birth to many others, until it was justly remarked, that "as schism had been their parent, so superstition amongst their followers would become their destruction." I don't wish to call in question the sincerity or the honesty of these men, but it seems to me that they greatly erred in being guilty of the sin of schism in leaving the Church for such trivial reasons; and now that bells in steeples and steeples themselves and stained glass in their windows are no longer offensive to them, and since they have unquestionably drifted so far from their original standard, they should return to the Church which their forefathers left for such trivial reasons. In these days men separate from their brethren, apparently without any idea that they are doing anything wrong, much less anything sinful, and the consequence is that we have on this continent fully 200 sects, differing from one another on some utterly unimportant points of doctrine or of practice—on points often arising from erroneous interpretation of Scripture, made by persons ignorant of the original languages in which the Bible was written. In this respect Protestant denominations around us occupy the very same position the Romanists do. They stand apart from us and from one another on account of things which were unknown to the Church of Christ for at least 1,000 years, and which they have made essential to their several denominations, but which, at the same time (when closely pressed) they acknowledge are not of *the essentials of religion*. Their distinctive principles are things *added* to the simple faith and practices of the earliest and purest ages of Christianity. Those of them who are orthodox acknowledge the old creeds of the Church, but have added some things which those who desire to join their communion must accept. They have set up terms of communion utterly unknown in primitive times. For a thousand years all the Church required was repentance towards God and adherents to the three creeds. My argument, that at the time of the reformation, the Church of England *returned to the purity of the Apostolic Age*, is greatly strengthened by a discovery made by Dr. Claudius Buchanan, a missionary of our Church, in the year 1801. As the discoveries of Layard in Nineveh have

greatly confirmed the statements contained in the Old Testament, so has Dr. Buchanan's discovery of a remnant of the Church of St. Thomas in India confirmed the claims of our Church to the Church of Christ in this land. Having heard some very indistinct accounts of this body of Christians living on the mountains back from the coast of Malabar in India, he visited them the first year of this century. He found them in great poverty. He examined their records, which convinced him of their claims to be the lineal descendants of those who had been converted by St. Thomas the apostle. They assured him that in the long intervening centuries they had no intercourse with western Christians. They had heard not a word of the division of the eastern and western branches of the Church, nothing of the claims of the Pope of Rome to be God and vicegerent on earth ; nothing of the discovery of the unseen world ; nothing of the reformation. They had been born, and lived and died in wonderful seclusion from the outer world. All their documents were in manuscript, but carefully preserved, and he left them without a single doubt on his mind regarding the entire truth of their statements. He found them with a written Bible, carefully copied out in Syrian, with a written liturgy, with three orders of the ministry—bishops, priests and deacons. They had two sacraments only—baptism and the Lord's supper. They confirmed their young, who had been baptized as infants. They knew nothing about transubstantiation, purgatory, the sacrifice of the mass, invocation of saints, worshipping of images, prayers for the dead. They had never heard of the Pope ; consequently they knew nothing of papal indulgences or papal infallibility. When spoken to about the Pope, they asked who he was ? When told that there were several different bodies of Christians in Europe, holding no communion with one another, they remarked that "there must be something wrong there." In short, there is no point in which we differ from Rome, on the one hand, and from Protestant denominations on the other hand, in which they did not differ too. Their doctrines on all essential points were the same as ours. These facts are all stated in Dr. Claudius Buchanan's unabridged edition of his "Christian Researches in India," published in the early part of this century. It has always, since I first heard of these facts, now more than fifty years ago, been a source of astonishment to me that our clergy have *not dwelt more upon them than they have done*. I feel, my clerical brethren, that the arguments I have brought forward regarding the foundation, growth, preservation and reformation of our Church, *ought to be known* to all our people young and old. And how are they to learn them, unless they are taught them ? And who are to teach them but yourselves ? Verily, I believe that we are guilty in regard to this matter.

Other bodies of Christians around us are not so much afraid of teaching their principles as we have been in times past. A clerical friend sent me some weeks ago clippings containing "an appeal from the Baptist Publication Society," and also a scrap from a Presbyterian newspaper. The Baptist Publication Society's appeal is in part to the following effect: "We do not make any appeal merely to secure your patronage for the Publication Society, however desirable we may and do consider that patronage to be. Our appeal is on behalf of *principles*, which, we believe, to be more important than any society or person. We desire to see those principles maintained, and the next generation so rooted and grounded in them so that nothing can ever move them from the truth. We regard the Sabbath School as affording a grand opportunity for the *cultivation* and instruction of both young and old, which we must improve to the fullest possible extent, in order that there may be growth and strength in every Baptist Sabbath School and Church. It will not do for us to assume that the children cannot be taught the *doctrine*. We must remember that the hope of the Church lies in the good, thorough work of the present, in order that the youth of to-day may be fitted to be the strong pillars in our Lord's Church of the future. See how these fundamental doctrines crop out in the lessons of every quarter, and consider how necessary it is for them to be understood and thoroughly taught. Our churches (*i. e.* congregations) are sometimes disaffected by apparently trivial causes. *If the teaching work* of these churches had been done in an efficient manner such results might have been impossible. We need to have a *reason* for our faith, and we need to be able to *give the reason* when it is called for. This condition is not attainable by the use of lesson materials, which either ignores or perverts the truth, as we hold it. We need not abate any effort for the conversion of souls; but with that we need to *round out* the Christian character of our people. Training gives strength, and we shall fail to do our duty if we neglect the training of the young." These, brethren, are weighty and wise words; and are as applicable to the teaching *our distinctive principles* to our people, young and old, as they are to the teaching of the distinctive principles of the Baptists. Let, then, every clergyman, every Sunday School teacher, every parent and every sponsor lay them to heart. Again at a Presbyterian Sabbath School Conference held a few months ago, within the bounds of this Diocese, resolutions on this subject were unanimously adopted, from which the following are extracts: "This Conference is convinced that in the Sabbath School a place should be given and every opportunity should be embraced which is presented by the course of lessons studied, and the use of the Shorter Catechism, for instructing our young people, both as regards doctrine and our

form of government ; and the Conference is satisfied, from the reports that have been received, that the teaching of these principles is not omitted and would express their judgment that yet more should be given them." And here I would express the great gratification I received from learning, whilst in England last year, how eminently successful "The Sunday School Convention," held in this city, was—far exceeding the most sanguine expectations of its originators. To my brother who so ably presided, to those who kept up its life and spirit so very ably, and to the teachers who attended it, many of them coming long distances to do so, I feel deeply indebted. Should it be the wish of the members of the Synod that we should hold a similar one in October next, I would be very happy, in compliance with such a request made to me to call one. But to return to my statement. I learned lately that the Rev. Dr. Vincent, of New York, at a Sunday school convention recently held in Toronto by the Wesleyan Methodists, said that "the children in Sabbath Schools should be taught their *distinctive principles*, in order that they might be able to contend against the arguments of other religious bodies ; for that he had found when they had no distinctive convictions they were *waverers and wanderers*, acknowledging no denominational allegiance." Again an able writer in the *Canadian Independent* says : "Let us endeavour to break up this spirit of rampart independency. In order to win victories we must adopt for our watchwords 'Organization, Order, Co-operation.' We must sacrifice self-will for Christ's kingdom. We must, too, make more of our Church order. Prominent men, both ministers and laymen, amongst us have sometimes boasted that they were 'not denominationalists.' Now, while bigotry is abominable, there is a spurious liberality which is mischievous. To say that I am 'not a denominationalist' sometimes means 'I don't care whether I am a Congregationalist, or a Methodist, or a Presbyterian.' Churches wholly of such materials would soon become extinct as such. We have no right to remain separate, unless we can give a reason for our existence as a separate body." We know that other bodies around us are acting on these principles and I do not blame them for so doing. If they believe that they are *right* they are, in my opinion, *bound to do so*. Are we then *alone* through a wretched timidity, or a nervous dread of being called *exclusive* or narrow-minded, to allow our children to grow up, in utter ignorance of our distinctive principles, of our grand history of our "apostolic succession" and our double witness against the false doctrines, the heresies and schism of Rome on the one hand, and the false doctrines, errors and schism of modern denominations on the other hand ? I trust not. *Faithfulness to what we consider to be the truth demands a very different course from us.*

INSTRUCTION AS TO THE EVIDENCES OF CHRISTIANITY.

Though I have detained you already longer than usual on these occasions, yet there is still one subject so very important, on which I feel bound to treat, and as this may be the last time I may be *ever* privileged to address you from this place, I trust you will bear with me a little longer. This is an age abounding with scepticism and infidelity, and the propagators thereof are most active. I may be mistaken, but I do not think that I ever heard of a person going about a country lecturing openly in favor of infidelity for gain until I heard of Col. Robert Ingersoll doing so, and making more money by his lectures than the lecturers in favor of morality and religion make by theirs. And I was shocked the other day to read in one of the great Toronto dailies a statement, boldly made by one of its correspondents, who wrote over the signature of "Agnostic," that "the story of the creation, the story of Eden, the origin of evil, the *flood*, the miraculous deliverances of the Israelites, and a host of other fables and fictions, are not only worn out, but have been abandoned by the best minds in the Church itself." I do not believe a word of it, because I know better. But, when such bold assertions are frequently made in respectable newspapers, which come daily into our families and are read by the young thereof; when it is boasted that an infidel work published in Toronto has gone to a second edition in less than a year, it becomes our clergy to see to it that our people are taught the grounds on which we believe the Bible to be the word of the living God. I believe that there is more of scepticism in our congregations than is generally supposed. There is in every congregation, especially amongst the males, persons upon whom all the appeals of the pulpit or in private interviews make no impression whatever. They are not confirmed sceptics, perhaps, much less are they open and avowed infidels; but Satan has filled their minds with such doubts that they are not prepared to take their stand on the Lord's side. The clergyman who has to deal with such persons was never himself harrassed in this way, and cannot, therefore, understand their real condition. Again, there are thousands of young men who are ill-formed, and who are by Satan kept inactive. They are influenced by arguments puerile in the extreme, and so feeble that those better informed could never imagine that they could influence anyone. I cannot help believing that our system of public school education (entirely divorced as it is from religion) is pandering largely to this evil. The cultivation of the intellect is the great object aimed at in our public schools, the thing placed continually before the pupils in them, as *the one thing needful*, whilst the cultivation of the heart and conscience is entirely overlooked. It was a wise saying of the great Duke of Wellington, that "if you cultivate the intellect to the neglect of the heart you only make a

man the greater devil." The democratic spirit of the age--when most men feel themselves wiser, certainly more highly educated, than their fathers were--tends in the same direction. They are more apt than their fathers were to take objections to establish things. They are unwilling to take things as much on trust as their fathers were. Because their fathers believed the Bible to be the revelation from God to man is no reason for them. They want to "judge for themselves" in this as in other matters. Now, my brethren, there is no use trying to contend against this current. The best way is to recognize and to be prepared for it. I believe that you should give your people *full instruction* in regard to the Bible being the Word of God, so that when the gainsayer brings to bear upon any one of them his plausible objections, he may find them not only well grounded in the faith, but also well able to give a reason for the hope that is in them. You should instruct them as to the genuineness, authenticity, uncorrupted preservation and inspiration of the Holy Scriptures ; including among other things a full investigation of the testimony from profane writers as to the fulfilment of prophecy to the very letter. You should adduce the evidences afforded by miracles to the inspiration of the Scriptures, and by the internal evidences furnished to the same effect, by the sublimity and excellence of the doctrines, and by the purity of the moral precepts of the Bible. You should show them the remarkable harmony that exists between the different parts of the Bible, and the proofs of its tendency to promote the present and eternal happiness of mankind, as furnished by an historical review of the beneficial effects actually produced in every age and in every country when the Bible has been cordially received and its precepts acted on ; together with a refutation of the objections that have been made against the Scriptures by sceptical infidel writers in modern times. These things should be made plain and level to the understanding of your people. This, I believe, to be the best way to prevent injury being done to your people by sceptical and infidel publications, lectures and conversations in their houses, in shops, in bar-rooms and other places of public resort. *Lay the foundations deep, strong and firm*, and then you need not fear what sceptics can do with your people. They will be able to answer them, as an aged Christian friend told me he answered such : "I may not be able to answer all your objections, but, having been well instructed in those matters, I *know* the Bible to be the word of the living God." But be very careful to make your arguments so clear and convincing that the youngest and most ignorant of of your hearers may understand you. Clear, distinct, positive instruction is imperatively demanded at the present time. It never was more demanded than now. The old times of the early apologists are upon us. If the faith was worth defending in their days,

it is worth defending now. St. Jude tells us that we are to "*contend earnestly for that faith.*" These are strange times, perilous times, in which we are living; times which are trying and will try men's souls to the uttermost. What the Church of Christ has now to meet are insidious evils; forms of error, under such specious guises, as Satan himself, transformed into an angel of light, knows well how to present. More dangerous these perils are than open persecution, because they address themselves to those human weaknesses where man is most likely to be overcome. The modern press has risen to be an almost irresistible power, and you should do your best to control it in religious matters. It gives shape to public opinion. It dictates even to the pulpit, and has assumed in some cases the guardianship of the faith. This is not all! Religious error is much more prevalent amongst us than many imagine. Has not, then, *the Church* something, very much, to do in behalf of her sons and daughters in such an age and times like these? Should she not teach them—teach them faithfully—what are the elementary principles of the faith of Christ and of the Church of Christ? Is there any cause for wonder or surprise if, when she neglects such instruction, her sons and daughters should be the victims of Romanism on the one hand and of scoffing and infidelity on the other hand? I feel perfectly sure that if our clergy, by diligent study would make themselves able to meet all the objections of those sceptically inclined, and would kindly visit any amongst their people whom they suspect to be even slightly affected by scepticism at their houses and talk kindly, but earnestly, with them on the subject, they would receive their warmest gratitude and be the means of preventing immortal souls from going headlong to perdition. It is just as much your duty to do this, my brethren, as it is your duty to visit those suffering from bodily ailments. The laity of the Church are calling for this positive, distinct Church teaching. If the Church has a foundation to stand on, they want to know what that foundation is. More than this an intelligent conviction as to the claims of the Church, a firm belief that she is the body that Christ himself appointed for the conversion of the world, is an indispensable means for the enkindling of an earnest zeal on her behalf, and for unsealing the fountains of an overflowing liberality. Our people have means ample for all our wants. But we cannot reach their hearts and consciences; we cannot call forth their gifts for the needs of the Diocese in any other way than by plain and honest dealing. It is downright madness to cast distrust upon the Church's claims to our loyalty and devotion. But lastly, let me press upon you, one and all, the absolute necessity of cultivating a spirit of holiness in your own souls, if you are to influence the world around you. If Churchmen in their daily lives and conversations, in their duty

to God, and in their intercourse with their fellow men, would live up to the spirit of their prayer book ; if they would only reflect in their lives the purity, holiness, entire devotion to God's service which pervades the collects and other prayers that they use in church, great would be our progress and amazing our influence. See to it, then, dear brethren of the clergy, that you lead those committed to your care along the narrow way of life, and oh, dear brethren of the laity, walk in that way, through God's grace, to your life's end.

